SOME NEW BOOKS. Fronds's Ernomu

A peculiar interest attaches to the Life and Letters of Erasmus by JAMES ANTHONY FROUDS (Northners) because, unless he has left unpublished manuscripts, it is the last book that we can hope for from one of the most accomplished and attractive writers of his time. It embodies the substance of a series of lectures delivered from the chair to which he had been called near the end of his life, the chair of Regius professor of modern history at Oxford, which had been successively occupied by Goldwin Smith, by Stubbs, and by Freeman. The subject many have been peculiarly congenial to the lecturer. because it led him back to those researches in eles records of the sixteenth century, to which i large part of his earlier years had been devoted, and because, as the reader will perceive, there was something in the character and tastes of Erasmus singularly sympathetic to his blog-From the nature of the case, the ethod followed in these lectures was eclectic; not a few points of interest in the career of the subject are untouched. One would have liked, for instance, to hear at least a reference to the fact that the burbarous mode of pronouncing Greek, which until recently prevailed in English schools and universities, was due largely to his suggestion and influence. One seeks in valu, too, an allusion to the codices which Erasmus, in the function of translator accepted as authorities for the Greek text of the New Testament, and to the value of them, compared with that of other codices then extant or since discovered. But everything we have no right to expect in a volume of this size, and we may well be thankful for what we find.

The subject of these lectures was born at Rotterdam in 1467, when Charles the Bold had just become Duke of Burgundy. He is supposed to have been born out of wedlock. The readers of Charles Reade's "Cloister and the Hearth" are familiar with the story of his parents; the tradition which is expanded in the novel is condensed by the present biographer in a paragraph. The father of Erasmus was named Gerrard, pronounced apparently Glerard, from pleren, "to desire," or to long passionatel;." In the son, the Dutch word was Latinized into Desiderius, and Greectzed afterward, according to the affectation of the time, into Erasmus, just as Reachlin became Capalo and Swartzerde was turned into Melanchthon, According to the legend Erasmus was, as we have said, a love child. The father was a man of some station, well educated, with a singularly interesting and even fascinating character. He fell in love, it is said, with a cortain Margaret, daughter of a physician at Sieben Bergen. Margaret was equally in love with him. For some unknown reason the relations, either his or hers, opposed their marriage, They were imprudent, and the usual consequences seemed likely to follow. At this dangerous time business of some kind required Gerrard's presence at Rome. He went, expecting to return immediately, when the marriag to be completed, to save the legitimacy of the expected child. He was detained. Communica were irregular. The relations sent a story after him that Margaret was dead. He believed it, and, in despair, became a priest. His mar-riage was made thus impossible, and he discovered the trick when it was too late for remedy; thus the child was born out of wedlock.

So, at least, ran the story, but, as Froude points out, it grow up out of tradition when Erasmus had become famous and his enemies liked to throw a slur upon his parents. The biographer thinks that it is, perhaps, a lie altogether; perhaps only partly sile. The difficulty is that Erasmus says distinctly that he was a second child, and had a brother three years older than himself. There is no suggestion of any previous marriage with another person The connection of his father and mother must, therefore, have been of long continuance. fact is that Erasmus's own letters are the only trustworthy authority for his life. From them. we learn that the two children were brought up like other people's children under the joint care of their father and mother, and that he, the younger, was his mother's special favorite, a bright, clever little fellow, with flaxen hair, gray-blue eyes, and sharp, clean-cut features; very pretty, it is said, and with a sweettoned voice, which seemed to say that nature meant him for a musician. The mother thought so, and proposed to make a little angel of him. and train him as a chorister. But he had no real gift that way, and no taste for it. In his later years he came even to hate the droning of ecclosiastical music. The chorister plan failing. he was entered when 9 years old as a day boy at a school at Deventer, his mother removing there from Rotterdam to take care of him. Here the portation of specie. His money was seized and my Encorrison Morier (the Praise of Folly). It little boy soon showed talent; he had an extraordinary memory, learnt Horace and Terence | was sent on to Paris absolutely penniless. The | make fun of anything. He is wise with the wise, He showed a passionate fondness for books; dewoured all that he could get held of; got up mimic debates: challenged other boys to dispute with him on points of language or literature. He says that he was ill taught, that his master was illiterate and did not understand him. He once composed what he considered an excellent Latin letter to the man, for which he expected to be complimented. The master only told him to mind his handwriting and attend to his punctuation. There was free use of the rod besides; nevertheless, when visitors appeared he was pointed out as a boy of exceptional promise. When he was eleven years old the Rudolph Agricola came to Deventer to inspect the school. Erasmus was brought up him; the great man patted his flaxen "this little fellow come to something by and by." Shortly after the visit of Agricola, the mother died. Her husband was unable to survive her loss. Erasmus and his elder brother Peter were now orphans, and were left under the guardianship of three of his father's friends, a banker, an unnamed burgher, who soon died of the plague, and the master of another school at Goude The banker was busy with his own affairs, and gave the schoolmaster the whole charge. There was some property in ready money, bills and land; not much, Erasmus says, but enough to launch his brother and himself respectably in the world. What followed was related afterward by himself in a letter to a high official at the Apostolic Court, and intended for the Pope himself. The guardian, he says, made away with this property, and he suggests fraud, but, as he adds that it is a common fault of guardians to neglect their wards interests, the biographer thinks that he means no more than that they were guilty of culpable negligence. The banker had left all to schoolmaster; the schoolmaster, on his part, had been careless; money, land, and bills were wasted a most to nothing, and, to crown their own delinquency and get their charge off hands, they agreed that the two boys should be sent into a monastery, and so, as the phrase went, be provided for. According to Church law, the monastic vow was not to b taken by any one under age. But practice and connivance had set Church law aside. Inconvenient members were disposed of in this way by their families. In the case, however, of a boy Erasmus, the custom was certain to in volve a grievous wrong. From his earliest years he had a passion for learning. He had no help from any one, and was refused access to books. But they could not be wholly kept from him. and he devoured all that he could get. He wrote verses, essays, anything that came to hand. From the first, as he admits, he was far too prepitate, flying at the first subject which offered. Huste made him carcless, and this fault always clung to him. In later life he was never able to endure the bore of correcting his books. But, although such was his disposition, he was alcountery was a sentence of intellectual death. Into a monastery, however, his guardians were resolved that he should go, and he was eventually coerced, at the age of seventeen, into taking the monastic vow in a house of Augustinian canons. His own account of the circumstances under which his profession was made was subsequently set before the Pope,

from whom alone some relief could be obtained.

although not even the Holy Father had power

to wholly obliterate his yows. Mones could ob-

tain a dispensation from the Pope for non-resi-

sense even in a fifteenth century monastery, and the prior of the Augustinian convent at las noticed the condition of Erasmus. It seemed shocking that a youth with so fine a talent should be smothered. Erasmus was advised to throw himself on the protection of the Bishop of Cambray, who represented to the Vatican that he wanted a secretary, and that there was a youth in a Holland monastery who would exactly suit him. A dispensation for temporary absence from the convent was thus secured, and Erasmus was given back to liberty. Long after, when he had become fa-mous, the Augustinians tried to refasten the yoke upon him. It was then that he told his story to the Pope, appealed for final protection, and found it. Previously his freedom had been conditional. The Bishop, though prelantic and parrow, was kind, and occasionally, when he could spare his services, sent him to improve himself at the University of Louvain. In 1402 he was ordained priest at Utrecht, and in the same year, he was enabled, through the Bishop's generosity, to enter the University of Paris Here, to eke out his patron's allowance, he took pupils, and his reputation for talent provided alm with as many as he wanted. What he learned himself he taught to others. Greek was then a rare acquisition, and was frowned on by the authorities, but Erasmus learned for himself the elements of the language, and in-structed his pupils in it. Booksellers also gave him small sums for his writings. Of his life in Paris but little is known; his enemies accused him of irregularities, and his friend the Bishop became uneasy at the rumors which reached him. Erasmus himself admits that he was not immaculate, though victous he never was,

With his poetry, his delicate wit, and his gray eyes, he was as fascinating to one sex as to the His biographer admits that he may have had his love affairs, very wrong in him, as he was a priest, but not the less common or the less natural. His habits were confessedly not strict, but Froude argues that original writers, men who do not borrow the thoughts of other authors, but have drawn their knowledge fresh from life, must have seen and known what they described. True enough, many drown in these adventures, but Erasmus, as it happened, was not submerged. He was, we are reminded, no dry pedant or professional scholar and theologian, but a very human creature, who bied if you pricked him, loving, hating, enjoying, suffering and occupied with many things besides Greek grammar, and the classics. His intellect, in truth, was not the intellect of a philosopher. It was like Lucian's or Voltaire's, lucid, clear, sparkling, above all things, witty; he was a classical scholar when classical scholars were few and in eager demand. The classics were then the novelty, the recovered and re-turning voice of life and truth, when theology had grown dry and threadbare-litere humaniores, as they have ever since been called, the very name and the comparative degree indi-cating the opening of the conflict between liberal culture and mediaval scholasticism.

It was in December, 1494, that Erasmus visited England with the young Lord Mountjoy, who had been one of his pupils in Paris. Morton was still Archbishop of Canterbury at this time, and Warham, who succeeded him, both as Primate and Chancellor, was Master of the Rolls. Without the help which he subsequently received from Warham, he acknowledged that he must have gone under. He was introduced also to Thomas More, then a lad of twenty: to Colet, afterward the famous dean of St. Paul's; to Grocyn, who was teaching the rudiments of Greek at Oxford, although no grammars or dictionaries were yet within reach. During this first visit, however, although he met with much kindness and generosity, he saw no pros-pect of making a position in England answering to his merits and expectations. Erasmus concluded, consequently, after a stay of some nonths, that he could do better for himself at Paris, where he was better known. At this point the biographer interjects the comment that there is no kind of person more difficult to provide for than a man of genius. He will not work in harness, nor undertake work which he does not like. His unavowed theory about himself is that he must be left to do as he pleases, and to be provided somehow with a sufficient income to live in independent comfort. To this had to come with Erasmus eventually. Ruling powers saw his value at last, and took him on his own terms. Meanwhile his Paris difficulties, which were chiefly financial, were provided for through the handsome present made by his English friends. Among them they contributed in money what would amount in modern currency to £200 sterling. Unluckily for Erasmus an English statute forbade the exconfiscated at the Dover custom house, and he | was like setting a camel to dance, but he can sadventure took wind and was much talked about. Erasmus saw that something was ex-

pected from him on the subject. He determined

to show that he was not occupied with

his private misfortunes, and, instead of

writing a diatribe on English custom houses,

he put together, with a few weeks' labor, a work

which was to be the beginning of his world-wide

fame. He called it "Adagia," a compilation

from his commonplace books, a collection of

popular sayings, quotations, epigrams, proverbs,

hand, with his own reflections attached to them.

Light literature was not common, and partly for

anecdotes, anything amusing which came to

that reason the "Adagia" was a splendid success. Copies were sold in thousands, and helped little to fill the author's emptied purse. From his English friends the book had an enthusiastic Warham, who was soon to be Archbishop of Canterbury, was so delighted with it that he took his copy with him wherever he went, sent the author money, and offered him a benefice if he would return to England. It was not long after the composition of the Adagia" that Erasmus translated the greater part of Lucian's Dialogues. Froude expresses the wish that more of us read Lucian now, and pronounces him by far the greatest man outside the Christian Church in the second century of our era. He had human blood in him. You will learn full as much from his dialogues of what men and women were like in the Roman Empire, when the Christian faith had taken root, as from the contemporary Christian writers. One of these dialogues, "Touching Those Who Become Companions for Hire," seems particuto have struck Erasmus, it indicated a temptation which beset him. Young men of talent in Lucian's time were tempted by the promise of an easy life to hire themselves out as companions to wealthy Roman nobles, to write their letters, correct their verses, amuse their guests, and write poems in their honor. Lucian traces one of these

unfortunates through his splendid degradation. till he is supplanted by a new favorite and flung aside like a worn-out dress. Too late to return to any honest employment, he sinks from shame to shame, till he falls to the level of the groom of the chamber and the housekeeper, and finally is left in charge of my Lady's pug dog. To such a fate many a promising youth was drifting in the fifteenth century, as well as in the second. A high education creates tastes for refinement, but does not provide the means of satisfying them. Krasmus had evidently experienced the temptation, and once, apparently, had tried to obtain such a post. Something like it had been offered him at a castle in the Low Countries, and his biographer thinks that Lucian may have saved him from accepting it.

It was in 1503-4 that Erasmus was enabled to take the long-coveted journey through Italy. He records that he amused himself during the passage of the Alps with composing a poem on old age, from which it appears that he taste for what we call the sublime and beautiful. He had, in truth, no interest in scenery, and cared only for mon and human things. At Rome he met with more than kindness. Among the princes of the Church there was the case and grace of intellectual cultivation calculated to lelight and charm him. The Cardinals saw his value and wished to keep him among them. The Cardinal of St. George, in particular became an intimate friend, and remained afterward the most trusted of his correspondents. He had but to consent to stay at Home and his rise to the highest dignities would have been dence, if they had friends at court. As a mat-ter of fact there was room for pity and good | Long afterward when the pinch of poverty

came again with its attendant humiliation, he admitted that he looked back wistfully to the Roman libraries and palaces, and glorious art, and magnificent and refined society. Yet strong as the inclination might be to yield. his love of freedom was stronger, free-dom and the high purpose of purifythe Church, which must be abandoned If he consented to remain in Rome, He might stoop to beg for alms from Bishops and great ladies, but he would not stoop to prostitute his talent. It was not long after his return from Italy, about the close of the year 1505, that h vent for the third time to England and resided and lectured for some months at Cambridge That he commended himself strongly to Prince Henry is evident from the fact that, when the latter presently became King, Erasmus, who, meanwhile, had returned to the Continent, was invited to England, in terms which entitled him to think that a considerable position awaited him there. Nothing came of the King's good will, however, except that he handed Eras mus over to Warham, who was now Primate, and who offered the now distinguished scholar the best living in his gift, that of Aldington, in Kent, worth sixty pounds a year, or six hundred in the money of our day. This was finally ac-cepted, but relinquished in six months, Erasmus being unwilling to bury himself in the country. far away from books. Thereupon the Archbishop settled a pension on him equivalent to the value of the benifice. This pension was paid for the rest of his life to Erasmus, who thus had an assured income of sixty pou sterling, at a time when a country squire was counted rich who had forty.

From the letters written (of course, in Latin)

from England by Erasmus at this period, Froude

translates his accounts of Dean Colet and of Sir Thomas More. The former we pass over, because Colet is well-nigh forgotten. It is otherwise with More, of whom a portrait is sketched in a letter to Ulrich von Hutten, who subsequently was to threaten to carry Luther off by force from Worms if the Emperor's safe conduct were not observed. Von Hutten, or a group of anonymous friends of his, were just producing the "Epistole Obscurorum Virorum" as a caricature of the monks. The satire was as gross as Rabelais', and Erasmus said that, though he was not particular, the coarseness disgusted him, and he discovned not only all share in the work, but all interest in it. Sir Thomas More, on the other hand, ardent Catholic as he was, loathed the monks as a disgrace to the Church, and frankly confessed himself delighted with the "Epistolie." Von Hutten was anxious to know more of this English admirer, and wrote to Erasmus for a de scription of him. "The task," Erasmus said, "is not an easy one, for not every one understands More. He is of middle height, wellshaped, complexion pale, without a touch of color in it, save when the skin flushes. The hair is black, shot with yellow, or yellow shot with black; beard scanty, eyes gray with dark spots-an eye supposed in England to indicate genius, and to be never found ex-cept in remarkable men. The expression is pleasant and cordial, easily passing into a smile, and he has the quickest sense of the ridiculous of any man I ever met. The right shoulder is rather higher than the left, the result of a trick in walking, not from physical defect. The rest is in keeping. The only sign of rusticity is in the hands. From childhood he has been careless of appearance, but he has still the charm which I remember when I first knew him. His health is good, though not robust, and he is long-lived. He is careless in what he eats. I never saw a man more so. He is a water drinker. His food is beef, fresh or salt, bread, milk, fruit, and especially eggs. His voice is low and unmusical, though he loves music, but it is clear and penetrating. He articulates slowly and distinctly, and never hesitates." Erasmus goes on to tell us that his friend More "dresses plainly; no silks or velvets or gold chains. He has no concern for ceremony, accepts none from others, and shows little himself. He holds forms and courtesies unworthy of a man of sense, and, for that reason, has hitherto kept clear of the Court. . . . He is a true friend. When he finds a man to be of the wrong sort, he lets him drop, but he enjoys nothing so much as the society of those who suit him, and whose character he approves. Gambling of all kinds, balls, dice, and such like he detests. None of that sort are to be found about him. In short, he is the best type of companion. His talk is charming. full of fun, but never scurrilous or malicious. "He used to act plays when young; wit delights him, though at his own expense;

he writes smart epigrams; he set me on

and jests with fools-with women especially, and

his wife among them. . . . He had his love

affairs when young, but none that compromised

him; he was entertained by the girls running after him. He studied hard, also, at that time at Greek and philosophy. His father wanted him to work at English law, but he did not like The law in England is the high road to fame and fortune, and many peerages have risen out of that profession. More had no taste that way, nature having designed him for better things Nevertheless, after drinking deep in literature he did make himself a lawyer, and an excellent one. No opinion is sought more eagerly than his, or more highly paid for. He worked at divinity besides, and lectured to large audiences Augustine's "De Civitate Dei." Priests and old men were not ashamed to learn from him. His original wish was to be a priest himself. He gave it up because he fell in love, and he thought a chaste husband was better than a profligate clerk. The wife that he chose was a very young lady well connected, but wholly uneducated who had been brought up in the country with her parents. Thus he was able to shape her character after his own fashion. He taught her books, he taught her music, and formed her into a companion for his life. Unhappily she was taken from him by death before her time. She bore him several children; a few months after he had buried her he married a widow to take care of them. This lady, he often said with a laugh, was neither young nor pretty; but she was a good manager, and he lived as pleasantly with her as if she had been the loveliest of maidens. He rules her with jokes and caresses better than most husbands do with sternness and authority, and though she has a sharp tongue and is thrifty housekeeper, he has made her learn harp, cithern, and guitar and practise before his every day." Erasmus proceeds to speak of his friend's literary work. "He has written a dialogue defending Plato's community of wives. He has answered Lucian's Tyrannicida. Utopla was written to indicate the dangers which threatened the English commonwealth. second part was written first, the other was added afterward. You can trace a difference in the style. He has a fine intellect and an excellent memory; information all arranged and nigeonholed to be ready for use. He is so ready in argument that he can puzzle the best divine on their own subjects. Colet, a good judge on such points, says More has more genius the any man in England. He is religious, but with out superstition. He has his hours for prayer, but he uses no forms and prays out of his heart. He will talk with his friends about a life t come, and you can see that he means it and has Froude recalls the fact that the real hopes.' subject of this picture had built himself a house on the Thames at Chelsea, which was of moderate and unpretentions dimensions, with a garden leading down to the river, not far from where Carlyle's statue now stands. The life there, as Erasmus elsewhere says, was like the life in Plato's Academy, and there Erasmus was a permanent quest whenever he was in London. No two men ever suited each other better, their intellectual differences only serving to give interest to their conversation, while both had that peculiar humor which means at bottom the power of seeing things as they really are, undisguised by conventional wrappings. More's mind was free and noble. As we have seen, Erasmus told Hutten that he was without superstition. At another time, however, he allowed that there was a vein of it, and that vein, as the sky blackened

with the storm of the Heformation, swelled and

turned him into a persecutor. Men who have been

themselves reformers are the least tolerant when

the movement takes forms which they dislike, Erasmus's inclination was to skepticism. He owns surprise that More was entirely satisfied with the evidence for a future life. Both, however, were united in the conviction of the seriousness of mortal existence. Both abhorred the hypocrisy of the monks, the simony and worldliness of the Church, and knew that, without a root and branch alteration of things, a catastrophe was not far off. Each went his way-More to reaction and Tower Hill; Erasmus to aid in precipitating the convulsion, then to regret what he had done, and to have a near escape of dying as a Cardinal.

Hitherto the world had known Erasmus chiefly through a few poems, the Adagia, and a few other like graceful treatises, and had recognized in him a brilliant, vagrant, and probably dangerous man of letters. Through all these struggling years, however, he had been patiently laboring at his New Testament, and he was now to blaze before Europe as a new star. Froude devotes a lecture to this work, and to the significance of its appearance. He begins by reminding us that the Christian religion as then taught and practised in western Europe consisted of the mass and the confessional, of elaborate ceremonials, rituals, processions, pilgrimages, prayers to the Virgin and the saints, dispensations and indulgences for laws broken or duties left undone. Of the Gospels and Episties, so much only was known to the laity as was read in the Church services, and that intoned as if to be purposely made unintelligible to the audience. Of the rest of the Bible nothing was known at all, because nothing was supposed to be necessary. Copies of the Scripture were rare, shut up in convent libraries, and studied only by professional theologians; while to the text were attached conventional interpretations which corrupted or distorted its meaning. Erasmus had undertaken to give the book to the whole world to read for itself—the original Greek of the Epistles and Gospels, with a new Latin translation. It should be borne in mind that the vernacular versions which already existed were merely translations of the as yet unrevised Latin of the Vulgate. The task of Erasmus was at last finished. The text and the translation were printed, and the

living facts of Christianity, the persons of Christ and the apostles, their history, their lives, their teachings were revealed to an astonished world. The effect was to be a spiritual earthquake. It should be noted, however, that Erasmus had not been left to work without encouragement within the Church. He had found friends even at Rome itself, and among the members of the Sacred College, who were weary of imposture and had half held out their hands to him. The Cardinal de Medici, who had succeeded Julius II. as Leo X., and aspired to shine as the patron of enlightenmen:, had approved Erasmus's undertaking, and was ready to give it his public sanction. Not that Erasmus had flattered Popes or any one to gain their good word. To his edition of the New Testament he attached remarks appropriate to the time which must have made the hair of orthodox divines to stand on end. Each gospel, each epistle had its preface, while notes were appended to special passages to point their force upon the established usages. These notes increased in point and number as edition followed edition, and were accompanied with paraphrases to bring out the meanings with livelier intensity. That a Pope should have been found to allow the publication of this work is declared one of the most startling features in Reformation history, Froude translates a number of these notes which embodied reflections upon the current doctrine and discipline of the Catholic Church. They were not thrown out, we must remember, as satires, or in controversial tracts or pamphlets. They were deliberate accusations attached to the sacred text, where the religion which was taught by Christ and the Apostles and the degenerate superstition which had taken its place could be contrasted side by side. Nothing was spared; ritual and ceremony, dogmatic the ology, philosophy and personal character were by what all were compelled to acknowledge to be the standard whose aw-ful countenance was now practically revealed for the first time in many centuries. Bishops, seculars, monks, were dragged out to indement and hung as on a public, gibbet in the light of the pages of the most sacred of all books, published with the leave and approbation of the Holy Father himself. The biographer cites facts to prove that never was volume more passionately devoured. A hundred thousand copies were soon sold in France alone. The fire spread as it spread behind Samson's foxes in the Philistines' corn. The clergy's skins were tender from long impunity. They shrieked from pulpit and platform, and made Europe ring with their clamor. They was given by this work of Erasmus. How, then, did it come to pass that Erasmus refused to side with Luther and the other leaders of the Reformation, but died, as he had lived, a consistent and fervent advocate of reform within the Church. About half of Froude's lectures may be described as attempts to answer this question in a way creditable to their subject.

It was natural that Luther, when summoned to the Diet at Worms, should think that Erasmus, who had thus far led the campaign against the corruption of the Church, would stand his friend. The appeal that he addressed to him was couched in simple, even humble terms. Never had Erasmus received any request more entirely inconvenient. He thought he had enough to do to fight his own battles. To take up Lather's was to forfeit the Pope's protection which had hitherto been his best defence. The Pope let him say all that he wished himself. Why lose an advantage so infinitely precious to him? Luther resented his hesitation, and Protestant tradition has execrated Erasmus's cowardice. Froude acknowledges that his conduct was not, heroic, but he submits that hero ism is not always wisdom. He reminds us that the Luther who, previously to the Diet of Worms, was wishing to be the brother of Erasmus, was not the Luther of history, the liberator of Germany, the regenerator of the Christian faith. To Erasmus he was merely an honest and perhaps imprudent, monk, who had broken out, single handed, into a noisy revolt. Doubtless, the indulgences were preposterous and the Church of Rome was an Augean stable, which wanted all the waters of the Tiber through it; but the beginners of revolutions are not those who usually bring them to a successf conclusion. The generous and the rash rush forward prematurely, without measuring the difficulties of the enterprise, and attack often in the wrong place. The real enemy, in the mind o Erasmus, was not the Pope and his indelgences, absurd as they might be, but the gloomy mass of lies and impudence which lay spread over Europe, and the tyranny of a priesthood believed to possess supernatural powers. If cultivated Popes and Bishops like Leo X. and Archbishop Warham, and hundreds more whom Erasmus knew, would lend a hand to help education an spread the knowledge of the New Testament, there might be better hopes for mankind in using their assistance than in plunging into a furious battle with popular superstition and th Roman hierarchy combined. It is not denied by Froude that Erasmus may have been wrong; that times come when rough measures alone will answer, and that Erasmian education might have made slight impression on the Scarlet Lady of Babylon. But he insists that Erasmus was not bound to know this, and deem it rather to his credit that he met Luther's a vances as favorably as he did. We are reminde that the moderate reformer always resents th intrusion of the advanced radical into work which he has been himself conducting with cau tion and success. He sees his own operation discredited, his supporters alienated, his end mies apparently entitled to appeal to the fulfilment of their prophecy, the leader-ship snatched out of his hands and passed on to more thoroughgoing rivals Frouds would not hastily blame such a man be cause he is in a hurry to disconnect himsel from hot spirits whom he cannot govern, and

whose objects extend beyond what he himsel

desires or approves. If Erasmus had publicly

washed his hands of Luther before the Diet of Worms and advised his suppression, he would have done no more than any ordinary party leader would have done in the same position. His real action was absolutely different. The Papal Nuncio had brought the bull condemning Luther to the Elector of Saxony, and had called on the Elector, in the Pope's name, to order Luther's works to be burnt, to seize Luther himself, and either execute the Pope's sen-tence or send his heretical subject as a prisoner to Rome. The Elector turned to Erasmus for advice, and went to Cologne to see him per sonally and consult with him as to what should be done. Erasmus told the Elector that Luther had committed two unpardonable crimes he had touched the Pope on the crown and the monks in the belly; but, however that might be, a German subject ought not to be given up t destruction till his faults had been proved against him. Luther had always profes self willing to argue the question of indulgences and to submit if they were shown to be legitimate. He had been so far a quiet, peaceful man, with an unblemished reputation, which was more than could be said of many of his accusers. The Pope's bull had offended every reasonable man, and, in fact, Eras-mus advised the Elector to refuse to obey it till the cause had been publicly heard. The advice is pronounced the more creditable to Eras mus because he knew that, if it came to a struggle, he would be himself in danger. He was not inclined to be a martyr, and, in extremity, meant to imitate St. Peter. So, at least, he had said. On this point Froude expresses a doubt whether a readiness to be a martyr is a very sublime quality, or whether those who needlessly rush on their own destruction any particular wisdom. It is conceded that such supreme sacrifice may at times become a duty, but only when a man has no better use for his life. It is not a duty of which he need go search. Touching the severity of the judgments sometimes expressed by posterity, Froude is tempted, he tells us, to make a general observation. Princes, statesmen, thinkers. who have played a great part in the direction of human affairs, have been men of superior character, men in whose presence ordinary persons are conscious of infer ority. On the other hand, their biographers, the writers of history generally, are of commoner metal. They resent perhaps unconsciously, the sense that they stand on a lower level, and revenge their humiliation when they come to describe great men, attributing to them the motives which influence themselves. Unable to conceive or unwilling to admit that men of lofty character may have had other objects than are familiar to their personal experience, they delight to show that the great were not great after all, but were very poor creatures, inferior, when the truth is known about them, to the relator of their actions. Froude, for his part, considers that Erasmus may be pardoned for not wishing to be burnt at the stake in a cause with which he had imperfect sympathy. The Papacy was the only visible centre of spiritual authority. Revolution meant anarchy and consequences which none could foresee. As long as there was a hope that the Pope might take a reasonable course, a sensible person might still wish to make the best of it, and the author of these lectures declines to say that mankind would have been the worse if the Holy Father had been able to follow Erasmus's advice. It is also obvious that Froude sympathizes with Erasmus in what the latter most disliked and feared from Lutner, to wit, the construction of a new dogmatic theology of which the denial of the freedom of the human will should be the corner stone. As a matter of fact, that was just what Luther did construct, and it was this which Erasmus eventually attacked in his book, De Libero Arbitrio, to which Luther replied with an equally contemptuous De Servo Arbitrio,

M. W. H.

in which he advised the veteran scholar to re-

main a spectator in a game for which he lacked

courage to play a manly part.

A New History of Greece, The Messrs. Macmillan have published the first volume of a new History of Greece by ADELPH HOLM, whose German text is reproduced with valuable additions in an English translation. The author makes no claim to that criti cism of the nicest minutize of research for which Grote and Duncker were remarkable, nor does he profess to offer the harmony and charm of the narrative of Curtius. His reason for attempting a new treatment of the subject is his belief that it is possible to do more than has hitherto been done in the way of presenting the most important facts in a comparatively narrow compass, and of sharply distinguishing what may be regarded as true from what is merely hypothesis. Recognizing that no one can under take to relate the history of a nation until he has formed a clear conception of its character, he maintained subsequently, and with good rea-son, that the chief impulse to the Reformation that point. He disagrees from those who regard the Greeks as a people which, in the most important phases of life, always hit upon the best or nearly the best, course of action, but, at the same time, he considers them an exceptionally high type of humanity, as the great seekers after perfection among the nations, possessing all the qualities which belong to the indefatigable nquirer. This view has guided him in his estimate of the great men among the Greeks. In his opinion the greatest Athenian statesmen did not always find the best solution of the problems before them. In them, as in the people at large, it is intellectual activity, marked not only or nainly in their achievements, but also in their aspirations, that specially commands our admiration. The principles of historical criticism on which the narrative is based are defined, as they should be, at the cutset. He holds, for instance, that the investigation of original sources should no longer start, as has been hitherto generally the case, with the reconstruction of ost authors, but with a study of the peculiar ties of the existing ones. He further maintains that the common criterion of the author's poin of view, especially in politics, must be applied with caution, lest it lead to partisanship, and consequently, to inaccuracy,

> The quality of this book can best be exempli fied by noting what the author has to say re garding certain questions upon which light is thrown by philologists and archieologists. Wha for instance, was the origin of the Greeks? To what other peoples were they related and in what degree of descent? By what route did they enter the countries which they inhabited in historic times? To what grade of civilization had they attained when they settled there? In the judgment of the author of this history philology alone can, at present, answer the questions. He acknowledges that a partial reply to the last might be expected from wha are called prehistoric studies, but he consider that these studies are not yet sufficiently ad vanced to justify the hope of any importan effect upon Greek history. Even if more primi tive tombs and implements had been discovered in Greece than has hitherto been the case, we should still be far from knowing with the required certainty whether, in individual cases the degree of civilization proved by them wa that of early Greeks or of later members of the family who had lagged behind in the march of progress, or even of foreigners. Many mor such discoveries are required to arrive by this method at results which should be included in short account of Greece. In Holm's opinion. therefore, it is only the science of language that for the moment, is able to return even a partia

answer to the questions above put. Of the races with which we are really as quainted the Greeks stand in closest connection with a number of Italian peoples, especially the Latins, Umbrians, and Oscans. More distantly related are the rest of the Indo-European people -Celts, Germans, Slavs, as well as Armenians and Iranians. It is a fair deduction that, of the above mentioned races, the Italians lived longest with the Greeks and were the last to separate from them. We arrive at this conclusion, be cause we know the Italian languages more of less satisfactorily. But, if we endeavor to recon struct early Greek history with the aid of phi lology, a great gap in our knowledge at once nakes itself felt. We know very little of the languages of the southern group of Italian people, of the races of the northern half of the Balkan Peninsula, and of Asia Minor. Yet these are unfortugately, the languages of the very people

who, is later epochs, came into the most direct contact with the Greaks, and with whom they must have remained united for a long time, perhaps longer than with any other. We are unsble to say with certainty how close was the con nection of the Greeks with the Phrygians, the Thracians, the Illyrians, and the Messaplans, nor do we know in what order the separation of the Greeks from these and other kindred races took place. For example, were the Phrygians the first to leave the parent stem? the Thracians, then the Hlyrians, and finally the Messapians? Was there ever a period when, after the separation of all these peoples, the Greeks and Italians lived together as so-called Italo-Graci? One cannot say. From the viewpoint of this inquiry the known Indo-European languages are by the present historian to a color scale, in which the transitional shades, and one or more of the principal colors besides, are wanting. The difficulty of arranging them in their proper order is obvious. If we could tell, for instance, which were the intermediate colors between the Iranian and the Greek, we should know more of the origin of the latter. Again, the known Indo-European languages are compared to the branches of a tree of which many other branches are unknown to us. Hence, we cannot say in what relation even the known ones stand to each other and to the rest. We do not know at what part of the trunk or from which bough what we call the Greek people was detached. Thus very little can be said even by philology to the questions regarding origin, re-lationship, and route. We assume a series of kindred peoples, extending from Phrygia to Sicily, but we are only justified in asserting that the Greeks were a branch of this family tree. Holm is inclined to concede the possibility that the cradle of these kindred peoples was, as many recent writers have contended, not originally in the interior of Asia, but in Europe. This, however, does not make it impossible for the Greeks have come into Greece partly from Asia Minor. Everything rather tends to prove that the Greeks entered their country from two sides, from the north of the Balkan Peninsula southward, and from Asia Minor across the Ægean Sea westward. If Europe was the original home of the Greeks, they must have sepa rated in Thrace to meet again in Hellas,

a rude people. If the Greeks say arod and

profron and the Romans are and aratrum for

to plough" and "a plough," it is clear that

they were both acquainted with agriculture be-

fore they separated. This agriculture would

naturally not be particularly advanced and Holm

concurs in the protest recently raised by Hehn

against exaggerated statements as to the high

development of the earliest Greek civilization.

No one will deny that the primitive Greeks must

have possessed a certain amount of knowledge of

the science and practice of agriculture. They

were not always on the move. They tarried here

and there, and sowed fruit seed and millet and barley. The earliest inhabitants of Thera were acquainted with agriculture, as the remains show On the other hand, we are reminded that the cultivation of the vine is a different matter. If the progenitors of the Greeks and the Italians carried grain with them on their travels, it does not follow that they took vine shoots as well. which require more than a short summer to grow up and bear fruit. Besides, wine is not, like bread, a necessary of life. There is, therefore, no necessity for the assumption that the earliest Greeks brought the vine with them when they settled in Greece; indeed, it seems more likely, when one considers the myths concerning the arrival of Dionysius that, at first, they did without wine. At the same time, it may very well have been known to the earliest Greeks. It is certain that cattle breeding provided the means of subsistence even more than agriculture. However different the surface of the soil might be in particular tracts, life in the various cantons of primeval Greece must, roughly speaking, have had much the same aspect. In the valleys corn was sown and cattle pastured. Bees supplied wax and honey, and wild trees sour fruit. The best meat was procured by the chase, while the product of the animal kingdom served a variety of purposes, such as clothing, vessels for eating and drinking, and bowstrings. Boats were covered with leather, and draught cattle were har pessed with leather thongs. From the wool of sheep was made the felt used for a head cover ing (Greek pilos, Latin pileus). Cloth was manu factured from bark and the fibres of plants, first plaited and afterward woven. The ordinary crockery was of clay, baked in the sun The weaker members of the tribe were carried one place to another. Their dwellings were either natural or artificial caverns, or huts built of wood, wicker work, mud, or stone. The practice in lake countries of driving piles into the bottem of a lake and building upon them no doubt obtained in Greece; Herodotus relate this custom of the Paonians in Thrace. That the earliest Greeks were acquainted with metals is rendered probable by the word for "copper being common to Sanscrit, German, and Latin; but, as the Greeks happened to have had another

use copper so much as stone implements in the

On the religion of the early Greeks, much light

has been thrown by philologists. An original

ligions has been demonstrated, thus bringing the origin of Greek mythology into clearer relief. The mythology of the Aryans proves to be simply their poetic expression of their mode of regarding nature. The variety of mythological agery, however, in the different ethnic off shoots arose from the peculiarity of the early languages, which, on the one hand, supply number of expressions for the same object and on the other hand, give the same general name to different objects. The consequence is that when different words are used for the same thing one thing is represented in a variety of ways. In Greek, German, and Indian mythol ogy, cow, horse, sheep, and ship all signify cloud Inversely, the same symbol can express differ ent objects; for example, horse can stand for cloud, light, sunbeam, spring, or wave. This multiplicity of terms explains the otherwise zling fact that only a few gods bear the same name among kindred peoples. There were many ways of expressing the same idea that diferent races easily adopted different names for the same deity. In spite of this, the Grocks had some names of gods in common with kindred races. The name of the chief god Zeus, genitive Dies, corresponds to that of the Indian god of the heaven Dyaus, genitive Divas, both signifying the clear sky. Another Greek name for the heavens dates from earliest times, Uranus corresponding to the Sanscrit Varunas, which originally denoted the covering, the all-embracing. Finally Eos. Latin Aurora, corresponds to the Sanscrit Ushan. The conclusion to be drawn is that the Greek belief in the divinity of the sky and its principal manifestations came from their first home and their early association with kindred peoples. Other instances of correspondence are given which bear on their face the appearance of remote antiquity, and thus may be considered as relics of the earliest beliefs of the Greeks. As regards worship, there is no doubt that prayer in the original form of the hymn dates from the earliest times. Of forms of sacrifice the drink offering is clearly the oldest; in India the soma, in Greece fermented honey or wine. Animal sacrifice is also admitted, but it is clear that in this respect migrations imposed much constraint and involved many innovations. Hence complete agreement in Greek and Indian forms of worship cannot

What, then, is the final answer of this has torian to the various fundamental questions mooted? It is this: That the Greeks on their arrival were a simple people of Aryan origin, but acquainted with agriculture and in possession of a national worship, the object of which was the sky and its phenomena, such as light, lightning, clouds, rain; and that these celestial phenomena and natural forces found expression in myths. By what route the earliest Greeks entered the country which they afterward pos-

One-half probably came into European Greece from the north by land, and the other half from the east by water. Whence, then, did the Greeks procure the radiments of the much higher civilization which they eventually attained? Holm, like other students of the subject, entertains no doubt that they received these rudiments from Asia, and in part, also, from Egypt. The civilization of Asia Minor might have come to the Greeks directly and without intermediaries, for they were in constant contact with the nations of that country: that of Assyria might also have been conveyed through the people of Asia Minor; but there was another route available, namely, through Phoenicla. Egypt could hardly communicate with Greece except through the Phonicians. Holm cites the reasons given by Egyptologists for believing that Greeks figure among the northern nations who, during the reigns of Rameses III., Menephta, and Sett I., and even as early as Thothmes III., invaded Egypt, that is to say, from the fifteenth to the twelfth century B. C. No stress, however, is laid on these and counts, because the interpretations of names are still contested and very problematical. Even if Greeks went to Egypt in those far off days it is pronounced impossible that they should have learned the civilization of the Egyptians there and then transplanted it into Greece. In the judgment of the present historian, that must have been effected by other means, Many writers of the present day suppose that much was transmitted by the Khetas, or Hittites, who, for a long period, held a very important position in anterior Asia. If, however, the Khetas did exercise an important influence on the Greeks, it is certain, also, that much must be ascribed to the Phoenicians. Holm does not deem it an easy task to describe the relation of the Phoenicians to Greece. No doubt their general character is known through the long researches devoted to them. They were a nation of sea traders, possessing at home municipal autonomy, and in this respect were the forerunners of the Greeks. They were Semitle in lan-

the Egyptians and Assyrians. Almost every-thing that comes from the Phoenicians is found, We pass to what the author has to say touching another question-namely, what degree of not in the narrow area of Phoenicia, but in civilization had the Greeks reached when they other countries. It has, therefore, been subfirst settled in Greece? It is pointed out that jected to foreign influence. Our knowledge of philology proves them to have been by no means them, consequently, rests, to a great extent, on

> by Cadmus contains two elements of probability, viz., that the Phoenicians, at some time or other, used their alphabet in Greece, and that the Greeks subsequently formed their own alphabet from that of the Phoenicians. Several pages dealing with this subject are summed up in the expression of opinion that the ancients were generally more correct than many of the moderns in their estimate of the influence of the Phoenicians upon Greece. The Phoenicians had trading settlements at many points on the coast. The Greeks learned much from them, but, with the exception of the alphabet, nothing of

great importance.

guage and religion; in art they were dependant

on others, especially on the Egyptians and the

dwellers on the Euphrates; nevertheless, they

knew how to communicate their borrowed skill

and knowledge to others. But no genuine re-mains of their civilization exist, like those of

conjecture, and it is, therefore, difficult to dis-

tinguish what is of Phoenician origin even in

Greece. According to the opinion of the Greeks

themselves, much that was new was introduced

into Greece by Cadmus, that is by the Phoni-

cians, namely, the worship of Dionysus, mining,

quarrying stone, and, above all, the use of the

siphabet. Holm would make, however, in

reference to this last point, some distinction.

He points out that the Greek characters cannot

be proved to have existed before the eighth

century B. C. They first appear in Crete. If

they are a modification of the Phoenician char-

acters, the change must have taken place some time before the eighth century. A long

period had then elapsed since the Phonicians

first came to Greece and brought their own

alphabet with them. Hence the legend respect-

ing the introduction of the alphabet into Greece

A FAMOUS YEAR. Some of the Distinguished Men Who Were

Oliver Wendell Holmes was born on Aug. 29. 809. William E. Gladstone was born on Dec. 29, 1809. That is a famous year in biography. Charles Darwin was born on Feb. 12, 1809. Edgar Allan Poe was born on Feb. 19. Alfred Tennyson was born in the same year; so was Pierre Joseph Proudhon, the French social philosopher. It is a year famous in the annals of military history, too, for Marshal Canrobert, the surviving French Marshal, was born in that year; so was Leopold O'Donnell, Spanish General; so was Frederick von Beust, the Austrian statesman, whose power in German affairs was eclipsed at Sadows. The Italian statesman, Ricasoli, was born in Florence on March 9, 1800. Park Benjamin, who died in 1864, was born in the same year. For Americans it will always be memorable as the year in

The death of Dr. Holmes has called up a flood of reminiscences on the subject of old men. Titian, the Italian painter was 100 years old when he died at Cadore, Italy. Donaido, when past 90 and utterly blind, stormed Constantinople. Isaac Newton was President of the Royal Society at the age of 83. and Landor finished his " Imaginary Conversations" at the age of 89. Brougham was a debater at 80, and Lyndhurst, when over 90, debater at 80, and Lyndhurst, when over 90, apoke in the House of Lords. Franklin was Governor of Pennsylvania at the age of 82, Marshai McMahon was 85 when he died. Neal Dow is now in his 90th year. David Dudley Field was 80 when he died. Chevreul, the French chemist, was 102 when he died in 1889. Cassius M. Clay, now living in Kentucky, is 84. Hamilton Fish, Governor, United States Senator, and Secretary of State, was another of the famous men born in 1809.

which Abraham Lincoln was born.

A WELL AS A BAROMETER.

It Is on a Cattaraugus County Farm, and Infallibly Foretells Weathe There is a curious well on the Flint farm, ta the town of Great Valley, Cattaraugus county. It is a natural barometer. Nobody ever passes that farm, winter or summer, if the weather is

settled, without asking something like this: "Does the well threaten a change?" For every one knows that if there is had weather coming the well will let them know it.

sure as sure can be. They call the well up there the "whistling well," although it doesn't whistle now. But that isn's any fault of the well. This well was dug about fifty years ago by the father of Col. Flint, whe now occupies the farm. He put it down fortyfive feet, but found no water, and dug no further. Instead of rater, a strong current of air came from the well at times. The opening was covered with a big flat stone, and for amusement a hole was drilled in the stone and a big tin whistle fitted into it. This whistle had two tones—one when the air rushed up from the well, and a different one when the counter current sucked the air back into the mysterious depths. It wasn't long before the discovery was made that within forty-eight hours after the made that within forty-eight hours after the outrusning current from the well started the whistle to shricking a storm invariably followed. When the tone of the whistle was changed by the reversing of the current, it was discovered that the change meant a change and the coming of fair weather. These weather signals never failed. When the weather was settled the whistle was slient. The whistle got out of order some years ago, and, for some reason, was never repaired, but the coming and going currents of air still prophesy the coming of their respective "spells of weather" with unvarying infallibility.

The Palls of the McKenste.

Pros the Albony Democrat.

McKenzie River is the outflow of twin lakes on the eastern slope of Hackerman's Pass. It is a mighty rushing torrent from the beginning. Two miles below Clear Lake are the first of two great falls, one at least seventy-five feet, and probably more, and the other one hundred feet, it is something of a task to get to them through the unbroken forest and over the roughest volcante rock imagnable.

Nothing concerning the scenery of these rugged regions is likely to be overdrawn. When we stood at the falls we were amazed at the marvels of grandeur and beauty presented. After Niagara none of us had seen anything supproaching these. It is a torrent that is precise tated over the face of a cliff in the heart of an indescribably rugged caffon, and leaps without a break to the pool below, filling the gorge and covering the cliffs with spray, and causing rank growths of grass and fragrant flowers to spring up on every inch of soil.